



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/770,433	02/02/2004	Adam Leslie Clark	40006997-0005-002	3363

26263 7590 09/05/2007  
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. BOX 061080  
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER  
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER
----------

TSAI, TSUNG YIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/05/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/770,433	CLARK, ADAM LESLIE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tsung-Yin Tsai	2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2007.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAIL ACTION

Acknowledge of amendment received on 8/21/2007 and made of record.

Acknowledge of amendment to specification paragraph 0033.

Acknowledge of amendment to claims 5 and 14.

Examiner found argument to claims 6-7 and 18-19 persuasive and with withdraw rejection, however, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Evelin (US Patent Number 5,083,195) and Carr (US Patent Number 6,118,823).

### ***Response to Arguments***

**Applicant's argument** – Amended claim 5 for proper dependence on claim 3.

**Examiner's response** – 112 rejections withdrawn.

**Applicant's argument** – Claims 1 and 14, as amended, are not anticipated by Yajima.

Independent claim 1 refers to receiving an encoded video file that includes a plurality of encoded video data tables AND a plurality of reference pixel value sets.

**Examiner's response** – Yajima teaches an encoded video file (figure 49 step S144 teaches encoding process of the reference pixel value sets as well as data tables) that includes a plurality of encoded video data tables (figure 49 step S136-142 discloses generating different set of data tables from the image, such as 2D color order table, collate color code of encoded pixel with 2D color order table data and even updating 1D color order table; these color order table are seen as the data tables) AND a plurality of

Art Unit: 2624

reference pixel value sets (figure 49 step 132-134 teaches the input of the image and output input reference pixel and 2D array reference pixels). Thus claims 1 and 14 are rejected.

**Applicant's argument** – For the same reasons, dependent claims 6 and 18 are not anticipated by Yajima. Moreover, dependent claims 6 and 18 refer to reference pixel value sets that include a red reference pixel value set, a blue reference pixel value set, a green reference pixel value set, and a black reference pixel value set.

**Examiner's response** – Examiner agrees that Yajima does not teach regarding to reference pixel value sets that include a red reference pixel value set, a blue reference pixel value set, a green reference pixel value set, and a black reference pixel value set and withdrawn rejection.

**Applicant's argument** – For the same reasons that independent claims 1 and 14 are not anticipated by Yajima, dependent claims 7 and 19 are also not anticipated by Yajima. Furthermore, claims 7 and 19 refer to a reference pixel value set that includes a reference color value set, a reference chrominance value, and a reference luminance value. Yajima does not describe or suggest the use of a reference chrominance value or a reference luminance value, as part of a reference pixel value set.

**Examiner's response** – Examiner agrees that Yajima does not teach regarding a reference chrominance value, and a reference luminance value and withdrawn rejection.

**Applicant's argument** – The Examiner rejected claims 2-5, 8, 10-11, 15 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Yajima and U.S. Patent Number 4,730,214 to Lambert et al. ("Lambert"). Neither Yajima nor Lambert, when considered singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest receiving, at a decoder, encoded video data tables and a plurality of reference pixel value sets. Lambert is relied upon for teaching dominant color values. However, Lambert refers to intensity values which are not the same as dominant color values, as that term is used in Applicant's specification.

**Examiner's response** – Yajima teaches encoded video data tables and a plurality of reference pixel value sets as disclosed above. Regarding Lambert about intensity values, Examiner see that the most intensity values will be the representing values, such these values will be the dominate due to it function to representation.

1. Applicant's arguments, see above, filed 8/21/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 6-7 and 18-19 under Yajima have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Evelin (US Patent Number 5,083,195) and Carr (US Patent Number 6,118,823).

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 14 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al (US Patent Number 5,764,804).

Yajima et al teaches a method of decoding an encoded video file and pixel (the file is composed of pixels, each pixel is processed individually), comprising:

(1) Regarding claims 1 and 14:

receiving the encoded video file, wherein the encoded video file (abstract, figure 1, column 1 lines 20-45) includes a plurality of encoded video data tables (column 1 lines 20-45, column 2 lines 40-50, column 3 lines 1-15) and a plurality of reference pixel value sets (abstract, column 1 lines 30-35, column 2 lines 35-40, column 3 lines 1-15);

decoding the plurality of encoded video data tables (abstract, figure 1, column 1 lines 45-60, column 2 lines 35-40, column 3 lines 15-35) using the plurality of reference pixel value sets (abstract, figure 1, column lines 50-55, column 2 lines 35-40, column 3 lines 20-25); and

returning decoded video data (column 2 lines 1-10).

(2) Regarding claim 16:

wherein each reference pixel value (column 2 lines 35-40) set of the plurality of reference pixel value sets includes a plurality of pixel color parameters

(column 1 lines 25-45, column 3 lines 1-15, figure 2, figure 5, figure 25) cross referenced with one dominant color value of the plurality of dominant color values (column 4 lines 25-35. There is a stated discriminating means that function to cross reference all color values to find at the reference/dominant values to store.).

(3) Regarding claim 17:

wherein the plurality of dominant color values comprises a red value, a blue value, and a green value (abstract, column 1 lines 25-67, column 3 lines 1-35, column 4 lines 25-44. The line buffer functions as a reference pixel generating mean for generating reference pixels for the input image data stream. Since the only color incoming data stream are only of red, green and blue, these will be the plurality of dominate color values to determine the reference color.).

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-5, 8, 10-11, 15 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al (US Patent Number 5,764,804) in view of Lambert et al (US Patent Number 4,730,214).

(1) Regarding claims 2 and 15:

Yajima et al teaches analyzing each encoded video (column 2 lines 1-10) data table (abstract, figure 25, column 1 lines 20-45) of the plurality of encoded video data tables sequentially (figure 4), wherein each encoded video data table (abstract, figure 25, column 1 lines 20-45, column 3 lines 1-15) represents an encoded video frame (column 2 lines 1-10); decomposing each encoded video data table into a plurality of rows (column 1 lines 30-35 shows how data is stream into the line buffer rows to determine reference pixels), for each row, determining a reference pixel parameter set of the plurality of reference pixel parameter (figure 1, column 1 lines 20-45, column 2 lines 35-50) sets by looking-up the dominant color value (column 2 lines 35-45) within the plurality of reference pixel value sets (column 2 lines 40-45); storing the pixel color parameter set into a decoded row in a decoded video data table (abstract, figure 1, figure 24, column 1 lines 45-60, column 2 lines 40-50, column 3 lines 15-30).

Yajima et al does not teach wherein each row includes a dominant color value, a scaled color value, and a scaled value set; and multiplying the scaled value set by the reference pixel parameter set to provide an expanded value set; multiplying the scaled color value by the reference pixel parameter set to provide a pixel color parameter set.

However, Lambert et al teaches wherein each row includes a dominant color value (column 1 lines 50-57. Intensity value is seen as the dominate value.), a scaled color value (column 1 lines 50-57. Not only grey scale values, but also for the familiar red, green and blue color scale values.), and a scaled

value set (column 1 lines 50-57); and multiplying the scaled value set by the reference pixel parameter set to provide an expanded value set (column 1 lines 50-57, column 6 lines 40-61. Adjusting is seen as the multiplication function of in scaling the reference value set to become the expended value set for display.); multiplying the scaled color value by the reference pixel parameter set to provide a pixel color parameter set (column 1 lines 50-57, column 6 lines 40-61. Adjusting is seen as the multiplication function of in scaling the reference value set to become the expended value set for display.).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Lambert et al teaching to Yajima et al regarding each row includes a dominant color value, a scaled color value, and a scaled value set and multiplying the scaled value set by the reference pixel parameter set to provide an expanded value set; multiplying the scaled color value by the reference pixel parameter set to provide a pixel color parameter set, such that using of the scaled value upon the reference/dominant values will produce a set of desired data signal from the data set (column 4 lines 1-5) and there will be no deviation from the original data set, and this will thereby reduce the likelihood of data corruption.

(2) Regarding claim 3:

Yajima et al teaches regarding wherein each encoded video data table of the plurality of encoded video data tables includes a plurality of rows, wherein

each row of the plurality of rows includes a dominant color value of a plurality of dominant color values

Yajima et al does not teach regarding scaled color value of a plurality of color values, and a scaled value set of a plurality of scaled value sets.

However, Lambert et al teaches regarding scaled color value (column 1 lines 50-57) of a plurality of color values (column 1 lines 55-57), and a scaled value set of a plurality of scaled value sets (column 1 lines 55-57.).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Lambert et al teaching to Yajima et al regarding scaled color value of a plurality of color values and a scaled value set of a plurality of scaled value sets, such that using of the scaled value upon the reference/dominant values will produce a set of desired data signal from the data set (column 4 lines 1-5) and no deviation (column 2 lines 5-10) from the original data, and this will thereby reduce the likelihood of data corruption.

(3) Regarding claim 4:

Yajima et al further teaches wherein each reference pixel value (column 2 lines 35-40) set of the plurality of reference pixel value sets includes a plurality of pixel color parameters (column 1 lines 25-45, column 3 lines 1-15, figure 2, figure 5, figure 25) cross referenced with one dominant color value of the plurality of dominant color values (column 4 lines 25-35. There is a stated discriminating means that function to cross reference all color values to find at the reference/dominant values to store.).

(4) Regarding claim 5:

Yajima et al further teaches wherein the plurality of dominant color values comprises a red value, a blue value, and a green value (abstract, column 1 lines 25-67, column 3 lines 1-35, column 4 lines 25-44. The line buffer functions as a reference pixel generating mean for generating reference pixels for the input image data stream. Since the only color incoming data stream are only of red, green and blue, these will be the plurality of dominate color values to determine the reference color.).

(5) Regarding claim 8:

Yajima et al further teaches wherein decoding the plurality of encoded video data tables (column 1 lines 45-60, column 2 lines 1-10, column 2 lines 40-50) further comprises constructing the decoded video data (column 1 lines 45-60) from a plurality of the decoded video data table (column 1 lines 45-60, column 2 lines 40-50, column 3 line 15-35.).

(6) Regarding claims 10 and 21:

Yajima et al teaches all that is mention above.

Yajima et al does not teach regarding expanded the expanded chrominance value, and expanded luminance value.

However, Lambert et al teaches regarding expanding values (column 6 lines 45-63. Adjusting that is used in this sense is seen as expanding the given data values that are encoded. Note that chrominance and luminance are inherit values that are traditionally collected.)

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Lambert et al teachings to Yajima et al regarding expanding the data values, such that using of the scaled value upon the reference/dominate values will produce the desire signals from the data set (column 4 lines 1-5) and no deviation (column 2 lines 5-10) from the original data set, and this will thereby reduce the integrity of the expanded data set.

(7) Regarding claims 11 and 22:

wherein the pixel color parameter set include one or more of RGB values, CMYK values, component video values, and composite video values (These are inherent values that are collected by traditional method to recreate the values of the pixel.).

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al (5,764,804) in view of Ando et al (6,662,309 B2).

(1) Regarding claim 9:

Yajima et al teaches about decoding the encoded video file information by reversing what was encoded.

Yajima et al does not teach about headers.

However, Ando et al teaches about header (figure 23. Figure 23 shows that header of different sorts that gives instructions regarding the processes of the data.)

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Ando et al teachings to Yajima et al regarding header, such that when the apparatus receiving the encoded data table processing it will process the data frame group back into the accuracy format.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al (US Patent Number 5,764,804) in view of Lambert et al (US Patent Number 4,730,214) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Ando et al (6,662,309 B2).

(1) Regarding claim 12:

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, teaches regarding encoded file.

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, does not teach about network files server.

However, Ando et al teaches regarding network file server (column 11 lines 45-60).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Ando et al teachings to Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, regarding network file server, such that it would be a secure and efficient way to transfer data file from one location to another.

8. Claims 20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al (US Patent Number 5,764,804) in view of Lambert et al (US Patent

Number 4,730,214 as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Ando et al (6,662,309 B2).

(1) Regarding claim 20:

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, teaches about decoding the encoded video file information by reversing what was encoded.

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, does not teach about headers.

However, Ando et al teaches about header (figure 23. Figure 23 shows that header of different sorts that gives instructions regarding the processes of the data.)

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Ando et al teachings to Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, regarding header, such that when the apparatus receiving the encoded data table processing it will process the data frame group back into the accuracy format and reduce the likelihood of outputting corrupt data set.

(2) Regarding claim 23:

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, teaches regarding encoded file.

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, does not teach about network files server.

However, Ando et al teaches regarding network file server (column 11 lines 45-60).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Ando et al teachings to Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert,

regarding network file server, such that it would be a secure and efficient way to transfer data file from one location to another.

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al (US Patent Number 5,764,804) in view of Lambert et al (US Patent Number 4,730,214 as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Kubota et al (US 2003/0084462 A1)

(1) Regarding claim 13:

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, teaches regarding decoded video file table.

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, does not teach broadcasting protocol include NTSC, PAL, SECAM, RGB, CMYK, and HDTV.

However, Kubota et al teaches regarding broadcasting protocol include NTSC, PAL, SECAM, RGB, CMYK, and HDTV (page 1 paragraph 0007, page 7 paragraph 0101).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Kubota et al teachings to Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, regarding broadcasting protocol include NTSC, PAL, SECAM, RGB, CMYK, and HDTV, such that it conforms with establish broadcasting standard for data transfer and display for the viewers.

10. Claims 6 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al (US Patent Number 5,764,804) in view of Evelin (US Patent Number 5,083,195).

(1) Regarding claims 6 and 18:

Yajima et al teaches regarding plurality of reference pixel value sets (figure 49 step 132-134 teaches the input of the image and output input reference pixel and 2D array reference pixels).

Yajima et al does not teach wherein the plurality of reference pixel value sets includes a red reference pixel value set, a blue reference pixel value set, a green reference pixel value set, and a black reference pixel value set.

However, Evelin teaches regarding where wherein the plurality of reference pixel value sets includes a red reference pixel value set, a blue reference pixel value set, a green reference pixel value set, and a black reference pixel value set (column 2 lines 5-20 discloses where the embodiment comprises these reference pixel for the phosphors of CRT. Furthermore, Examiner does not see a point for a black reference pixel value set. The color code for black is just a series of zeros, where the length of series of zeros depends on the capabilities of bit strings of the monitor can display, therefore, a series of zeros is no need for comparison to another series of zeros that represent the color black to be compared).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Evelin teachings to Yajima et al regarding using reference

pixel values such as red, blue and green. Having reference values to compare will enable the display of these colors to compensate and adjust the display for better viewing.

The motivation to combine these teachings will enable a color display to compensate for changes in its optical characteristics and for any changes in the ambient lighting conditions (column 1 lines 40-50), as well as enabling the individual aging of one of the phosphors to be determined and corrected without affecting the others (column 1 lines 55-60).

11. Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al (US Patent Number 5,764,804) in view of Evelin (US Patent Number 5,083,195) as applied to claims 6 and 18, repetitively, above, and further in view of Carr (US Patent Number 6,118,823).

(1) Regarding claims 7 and 19:

Yajima et al and Evelin teaches regarding plurality of reference pixel value sets (Yajima et al , figure 49 step 132-134 teaches the input of the image and output input reference pixel and 2D array reference pixels) and reference color value set (Evelin, column 2 lines 5-20 discloses where the embodiment comprises these reference pixel for the phosphors of CRT).

Yajima et al does not teach regarding a reference chrominance value and a reference luminance value.

However, Carr teaches regarding reference chrominance value and a reference luminance value (figure 10 discloses luminance reference values to luminance subtractor logic and chrominance reference values to gram buffer).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Carr teachings to Yajima et al and Evelin regarding having reference chrominance value and a reference luminance value. Having reference values to compare will enable the display of these colors to compensate and adjust the display for better viewing.

The motivation to combine these teachings enhanced addressing control scheme for a frame difference unit which is capable of writing and reading luminance and chrominance data, at the same time, to and from the predicted array, while maintaining the order of the data written the same as the output order of the data to be sent. Further, the present invention addresses the problem of controlling shared access to the shared-use predicted error array of the frame difference unit (column 2 lines 15-25).


### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tsung-Yin Tsai whose telephone number is (571) 270-1671. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8 am - 5 pm ESP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jingge Wu can be reached on (571)272-7429. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tsung-Yin Tsai  
August 29, 2007



JINGGE WU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER